

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

None of the claims are amended herein.

Claims 8, 15-19, and 24 are "objected to."

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-26 are currently pending and under consideration in the present application.

II. OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

In item 1, on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts, "the title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed." The title is amended herein to recite "A HEATING COOKER FOR EVENLY DISTRIBUTING HOT AIR IN COOKING CHAMBER."

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the title is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 25 AND 26 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY TANAKA ET AL. (US 4,337,384)

The present invention as recited in claim 1, relates to a heater cooker, which comprises a chamber cover. The chamber cover has "a plurality of air distribution ports *provided along an edge of the chamber cover* to guide the air from the fan chamber" (emphasis added).

Tanaka teaches a cooking appliance of a hot air circulating type, which includes a heating chamber 2. Tanaka teaches that the circulation of air heat by heating means 15 is accomplished by drawing air through inlet perforations 21 in the central area of a partitioning wall 18 and discharging the hot air from a compartment 20 into the heating chamber 2 through outlet perforations 22 provided in the peripheral area of the partitioning wall 18 (see column 3, line 64 – column 4, line 2 and FIG. 3).

The partitioning wall 18 of Tanaka is not the same as the claimed chamber cover. Tanaka teaches that the partitioning wall 18 is provided with the outlet perforations 22. However, the outlet perforations 22 are not provided along an edge of the partitioning wall 18. In contrast to the partitioning wall 18 of Tanaka, the claimed chamber cover is provided with air distribution ports along an edge of the chamber cover (see claim 1). It is submitted therefore

that Tanaka does not teach or suggest the features as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Similar to claim 1, claim 25 recites a chamber cover having “a plurality of air distribution ports provided along an edge of the chamber cover to guide hot air discharged from the fan chamber to the edge of the chamber cover to discharge the hot air to the cooking cavity.” It is submitted that Tanaka also does not disclose the features recited in claim 25 of the present invention.

Claims 3 and 26 depend from claims 1 and 25, respectively. For at least the reason that claims 1 and 25 distinguish over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 26 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the objection is overcome.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2, 4-7, 9-14, AND 20-23 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(A)

Claims 2, 4-7, 9-14, and 20-23 depend from claim 1. Dependent claims 2, 4-7, 9-14, and 20-23 (depending, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1) recite patentably distinguishing features of their own, and further, are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependency from independent claim 1.

For example, in contrast to Tanaka and McFadden, dependent claim 2 recites, “air distribution ports are defined by a plurality of protuberant parts which are provided along the edge of the chamber cover by protruding predetermined portions of the edge of the chamber cover toward the cooking cavity, so that the protuberant parts form channels directed outward and opened at the edge of the chamber cover.” The Examiner relies on the directing means 26 of McFadden. However, the directing means 26 of McFadden are not the same as the claimed protuberant parts on the chamber cover as recited in claim 2 of the present invention.

In contrast to Tanaka and Takakura, for example, claim 4 recites, “an inner surface of an inner casing and the chamber cover are coated with an insulating material to prevent occurrence of sparks caused by the microwaves at both the inner casing and the chamber cover.” The Examiner asserts, “Takakura shows that it is well known...to coat the oven chamber surfaces with an insulating material.” However, coating oven chamber surfaces as disclosed by Takakura is not the same as coating an inner surface on an inner casing and the chamber cover as recited in claim 4 of the present invention.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the objection is overcome.

V. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12-21-04

By: Derrick L. Fields
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone (202) 434-1500
Facsimile (202) 434-1501